

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Marcos Pasaye,

Case No. 2:17-cv-02574-JAD-VCF

Plaintiff

Order re: extensions of time

State of Nevada ex rel.,

[ECF Nos. 30, 35]

Defendant

After the court granted plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction,¹ defendants filed a motion for reconsideration.² Plaintiff moved the court to extend his deadline to oppose³ that motion and then filed his opposition within the extended time he requested.⁴ I find good cause to extend that deadline and deem plaintiff's opposition [ECF No. 31] timely.

But after defendants filed their reply brief, plaintiff filed a motion asking for an extension to respond to that reply brief, too.⁵ That request is denied. The rules of this court allow motion, response, and reply brief. This district's Local Rule 7-2(b) explains that "repplies"—which is what a reply to a reply would be—"are not permitted without leave of court" and that "motions for leave to file a surreply are discouraged." Because the rules do not permit plaintiff to file a reply brief, and plaintiff did not seek leave to file, a surreply here, plaintiff's motion to extend the time to file one is denied.

¹ ECF No. 25.

2 ECF No. 27.

³ ECF No. 29.

23 | ⁴ ECF No. 31.

⁵ ECF No. 35.

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to extend his deadline to
2 respond to the motion for reconsideration [ECF No. 30] is **GRANTED** and his response brief
3 **[ECF No. 31] is deemed timely;**

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for extension of time to file a reply
5 to the reply **[ECF No. 35] is DENIED.** Plaintiff is not permitted to file an additional brief
6 regarding the pending motion for reconsideration [ECF No. 27].

7 Dated: May 30, 2019

8 _____
9 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
10 _____



11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23